

JK 1903

.W3

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00008454723











# Anti-Woman Suffrage and Criticisms

---



By  
R. C. WALSH, Ph. G.,



Price Ten Cents





# Anti-Woman Suffrage and Criticisms

---



*Robert*  
By  
R. C. WALSH, Ph. G.,

Price Ten Cents

JK1903  
W3

~~#010~~

OCT 23 1916

©Cl.A 444520

no 1.

U. 7 R  
Mar. 13. 17.

## PREFACE



AM not writing this because it's a pleasure to me, for it is far from it; I dislike very much to criticize and ridicule people in such a manner, but I feel it my duty, and that there can be no further delay.

This booklet is intended to call your attention to some reasons why women should not vote, and why men should not permit it.

My argument is in the boldness of one who knows no fear.

My object is to help visionize the world with women voting and women rulers and the result here and hereafter, also to show men that they are wrong when they give up any of the ruling power.

ROBERT C. WALSH, Ph. G.

2403 N. 9th Street

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mailed on receipt of 10c. One or two-cent postage stamps are acceptable.

Copyright claimed.



# Anti-Woman Suffrage and Criticisms

I don't want anyone to think I could not criticise men in many ways other than herein contained.

In this booklet I am trying to present my reasons for opposing "votes for women" in such a clear comprehensive manner that it will be impossible for any who have education enough to read to fail to understand even any part of it.

I am not writing it for a class; it's for all.

I expect to call your attention to bible references enough to convince you that to be an advocate of "votes for women" is evidence of disbelief in God, or that you do not know the bible. I also will attempt to show its injustice and absurdity and what evils we should expect of it from a worldly point of view. We nearly all fail to do anywhere near the amount of good we should do, because we lack the necessary interest, or lack time after dealing with the problems of life which are forced upon us, or because we do not know where to find the information we need and would gladly accept if we could get it in a condensed form so time would permit us to grasp it. This booklet, I hope, will help people to see their duty, especially when voting on the woman suffrage question. I am not a highly educated writer with an abundance of time and experience, therefore I am forced to rely wholly upon the righteousness of the stand I am taking for results. Those who read this booklet studiously are almost sure to give the subject a great deal more thought in the future than they have in the past, and if the majority will only get the evidence in any case plainly before them and study it thoroughly, the verdict will not be far from right if they have a knowledge of the law necessary to make them capable judges. It is to get the evidence to you and the law governing the verdict that I am writing this. This is a time when the question of votes for women is being agitated very strongly by a comparatively small percentage of women, and if no one produces any of the abundant arguments there are against them, the average man who has not given it any thought will favor it because he wants to favor the women and he has an idea most of them are in favor of it, but such is not the case. The arguments of those who are, are as weak as drops of water falling upon a rock, but if they are kept up continuously there must be something done or either will have an effect, and now with the reasonableness of why women should not vote the men are to blame if they do. The men are to blame if women are legally allowed to do that which is not right regardless of what it is. A free government demands an intelligent citizenship for its support. Its place or standing depends upon the mental, physical and moral worth of its

people, therefore I urge everybody to study hard. Do not waste time, for you never can recall it. Endeavor to be intelligent, for therein lies the keys to success. Some, of course, is attained by accident, but that's not the rule. We should not blame people for doing anything our laws permit. We should endeavor to have useless and detrimental laws repealed or remedied where they are faulty. No doubt we have laws that are worse than the evil they were intended to remedy or control. If people do unjust things because of their ignorance they are not always to blame. The ones who know better and permit it are at fault and to blame in part or wholly. Our life work should be largely composed of endeavoring to enlighten people; to alleviate suffering; to eliminate discord and injustice. To eliminate one side of a question by means of a thorough investigation of all points bearing upon it if the question is in any way hampering humanity on the road to just prosperity or happiness is a noble deed. I have no sympathy as a rule for those who try to do it by force; enlightenment is the system. We should read a great deal, study the bible and historical literature of various kinds. Inform ourselves as to what is now being done and what has been done, and see who deserves credit for the many blessings we now enjoy. The main source of education is our reading matter, that is, if we read, and it is next to impossible to be a good citizen unless we do. I believe books to be the most valuable heritage we could receive and the most lasting and beneficial legacy we can leave. As education or learning gains a footing in our minds we notice unfounded ideas disappearing and we find ourselves turning our back on many destructive and disastrous parts of our former life endeavoring to go ahead the faster. We find ourselves filled with a hope that the future may wrest successes from past mistakes and guesses. Unless we read a great deal, it's as impossible to be fair in our decisions on the problems that confront us as it would be for a jury to render a fair verdict without hearing the evidence or knowing the law governing the verdict. Therefore I plead with everybody to read this book because it deals with an important subject which is before us for a prompt decision. I will make it as short as I can for three reasons: First, it will not take much of your time; second, it reduces the cost, and third, I am engaged otherwise. By making it short more people will read it. Ignorance is the mother of carelessness; neglect of duty, and misdirected energy. Education; I don't mean by education just the little we get in schools or school books. We must add to that the knowledge that is to be gained by reading our newspapers and publications of various kinds, and don't fail to study the bible. If we will do this we will find that we are more prone and able to detect wrong and less able to resist the desire to down it. 2 Tim. 2:15: Study to show thyself approved unto God, a

workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

Eccl. 12:13, in part: Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.

The dangerous person is not the one who tries to excite discontent; discontentment, backed up by true manliness; education and determination is sure to improve conditions, for it brings subjects to our notice in a forceful manner, and the natural result is eventually to improve conditions even if the agitator was entirely wrong, for enlightenment is the great rectifying and unity-producing power, and when the agitator is wrong it is sure to bring out some of the opposing force. People are not all so easy that they will be scared into doing things they are sure is wrong. We can plainly see that our politicians are playing the game for votes as hard as they can, and most of them are very much in hopes the people will keep women out of politics while they have to work for them in order to (as they think) get a few more votes and keep things running smooth for themselves. The dangerous ones are those who say what is to be will be, and there is no use wasting energy and time trying to improve things. We should be very careful to see to it that we are not trying to improve by promoting something that is forbidden in God's word. For such a course is doomed for failure. I will now give some bible references which are worthy of careful study before voting on woman suffrage amendment:

1. Peter 3:1-5, inclusive: Likewise ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives;

2. While they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear;

3. Whoso adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel;

4. But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptable, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit which is in the sight of God of a great price;

5. For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves being in subjection unto their own husbands. St. Matthew 5:5: Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.

If women could only abound with Godliness (meekness, love, patience, and kindness) they would get everything in this world that is possible for them to get to make them happy, with no further effort, for the inheritance is promised in God's word and it's the natural result of a woman's kindness to man if it's within the man's power.

Proverbs 12:11: He that tilleth his land shall be satisfied with bread; but he that followeth vain persons is void of understanding.

Do we not understand what is written in the above portion of God's word? Are our women not following vain persons enough to show what God thinks of their ability to understand; especially the type who are clamoring for a legal right to vote? Proverbs 12:1: A virtuous woman is a crown to her husband; but she that maketh ashamed is as rottenness in his bones. Prov. 31:10-31 inclusive, tells us what is meant by "a virtuous woman": (10) Who can find a virtuous woman, for her price is far above rubies. (11) The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her so that he shall have no need of spoil. (12) She will do him good and not evil all the days of her life. (13) She seeketh wool, and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands. (14) She is like the merchants' ships; she bringeth her food from afar. (15) She riseth also while it is yet night, and giveth meat to her household, and a portion to her maidens. (16) She considereth a field, and buyeth it; with the fruit of her hands she planteth a vineyard. (17) She girdeth her loins with strength, and strengthened her arms. (18) She perceiveth that her merchandise is good; her candle goeth not out by night. (19) She layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff. (20) She stretcheth out her hand to the poor; yea, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy. (21) She is not afraid of the snow for her household; for all her household are clothed with scarlet. (22) She maketh herself coverings of tapestry; her clothing is silk and purple. (23) Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land. (24) She maketh fine linen, and selleth it; and delivereth girdles unto the merchant. (25) Strength and honor are her clothing; and she shall rejoice in time to come. (26) She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness. (27) She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness. (28) Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her. (29) Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all. (30) Favor is deceitful, and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord she shall be praised. (31) Give her of the fruit of her hands and let her own works praise her in the gates.

The above description of the daughter that excellest all the virtuous daughters shows that woman is expected to lend a helping hand instead of being a burden to her husband. If they would only be willing to do their part at home and quit their expensive customs, men could afford to get married and have families, and naturally there would not be so many single people, both men and women, looking for free love and companionship on the installment plan. I believe that the wearing of good clothing is not displeasing to God as long as the



design indicates good judgment; for health, comfort, neatness and modesty, and not after vain fashion.

We soon tire of the design of the height of style or fashion of any time, because it is so ridiculously absurd that after it has passed, one would wonder how any had ever decided to wear such; naturally it soon vanishes and makes room for another, which, perhaps, is no better, but is accepted because many women seem to think they would rather be dead than out of style, thus they keep up the vain extravagance.

We don't get tired of the looks of a bird, or an animal, and think they are a back number, because they get a new suit just like the one they just wore out. Oh, no, we admire their new suit every time, and it really looks beautiful because the harmonious design and its color or colors are as God wanted them. Fashion is only a name for one branch of folly or foolishness. The reason for it is, it affords a means for some business people to gain wealth through the folly practiced by others who are full of vanity.

Prov. 14:1: Very wise woman buildeth her house, but the foolish plucketh it down with her hands.

Are not the women who are spending money and time in an effort to gain a legal right to vote, plucking their houses (homes) down by squandering money and time in their effort which seems to indicate they are blind to everything else, and their reasons for wanting it are absurd? If they are finally granted that privilege it can not be otherwise than a continuous increased cost of elections and greatly increased troubles in homes with election results about the same. Can not the God-loving, well-informed people all say thoughtfully that the class of women such as are clamoring for votes are an undesirable class? Usually no benefit to their home and family and a menace to the best interests of humanity. The clothing and acts of people portray their ability to think. Matt. 7:20: Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

Can women say with a clear conscience they want to vote in order that the political slate may be purified when they show in all their dealings that they are as prone, or more so, than men, to resort to unfair tactics in order to make things go the way they want them? I have before me a St. Louis paper which gives an account of a meeting held in Columbia, Mo., last spring. It states suffrage O. K'd by mothers in political trick. According to that report, Mrs. G. F. Decker catches Columbia delegates "asleep at switch."

At that convention of the Mothers' Congress and the Parent-Teachers Organization, their leader, Mrs. G. F. Decker, President of the Woman's Council of Webster Groves, supplied a demonstration of what she is willing to resort to in an effort to have her way when she

caused the passage of a resolution indorsing equal suffrage in the face of strong opposition. This is the way it was done: Mrs. Decker introduced her resolution. Her opponents declared it out of order, contending that the convention's interest centered in "better mothers and better babies," so she dropped the subject and just before the close of the meeting she moved the passage of several pending resolutions. The motion carried and it was a day or two before the opposition discovered that the suffrage resolution was included among them. Now, if a woman who, as I infer, is a member of the W. C. T. U., will resort to such unfair tactics, where can we expect to find women to elevate politics?

In another paper, under the heading "Diamond Ring for Best Dry Oration by Child," we find the W. C. T. U. working for equal suffrage in the feature of that occasion entitled "Uncle Sam's Wash Day." It looks like many women of today are unable to think or do anything without having a woman suffrage demonstration, and they even go so far as to continuously annoy our President and high government officials at all times, even when very important questions are facing them and must be attended to without delay. Such actions display the same amount of judgment that a child would display by insisting on its mother answering questions about doll clothing while the mother is attempting to extinguish a fire that is threatening to destroy their home. Is that the kind of voters we need?

I inquired of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch some time ago, what state or states of this U. S. A., if any, has disfranchised women after they had been granted that privilege? Why and how they did it? I infer from the answer under the heading, "Where Women Vote," in the column Answers to Queries, that the informant is strongly in favor of woman suffrage. The remark that twelve states and Alaska have had sufficient sense of justice to give women the ballot fully makes it appear as though the informer has a great deal of contempt for a person or state that is so lacking in sense of justice as to withhold the ballot from women. I did not ask for a personal opinion, but I do want to thank the informant for the great amount of information. I also am glad that little bit of caustic personal opinion was included, for it opens the way for more information and right will win if we can only get all the evidence clearly before the people. The informant also said no state has been so lacking in justice as to repeal a woman suffrage enactment. I hope the answers are usually correct, but that one evidently is not. I will now answer it myself: The State of New Jersey in 1807 repealed the equal suffrage enactment after an election was held in February of that year. At that election the women did so much fraudulent voting that the whole election had to be set aside as illegally conducted. Women had been permitted to vote if they had a

certain amount of property. The ballot was given them by an act of July 2, 1776, but it seems they did not vote at all until after 1790, and very little until 1800 and later.

I take it for granted that the writer of the answers to my questions is a believer in God. If so, is it not our plain duty to obey his commands? We should try to evade the wrath of God, which is for the children of disobedience spoken of in the fifth chapter of Ephesians, sixth verse: Let no man deceive you with vain words, for, because of these, cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.

Let us not be in a hurry about accusing God of being unjust or that he thoughtlessly overlooked important matters or that he did things by guess. We should stop long enough to ask ourselves, Why is it God, in his dealings with mankind and seeing women in the servile condition of centuries ago, did not raise a protest? Do you think he was unjust or insane or that he could not have made the female as strong or stronger than the male? He expects us to use the brains he has given us, and he also expects us to strive to convert people in all lands to the extent that what Jesus Christ told us to pray for would come to pass. Jesus instructed us to pray to God for his kingdom to come and his will be done on earth as in heaven.

Shall we say Jesus did not know what he was talking about? Do you think we should pray for it and not work for it?

God from the beginning has placed the authority in the man's hands and is looking to the man to rule, and has shown that the woman's place is a place of meekness and subjection. God has given the man superior strength; he also has given him the inventive mind and something like equal numbers, so he would have no reasonable excuse for not ruling, and I believe service is what he wants and expects and not excuses.

I am calling your attention to these things because I believe it very necessary to heed them. We are being pushed away from God because of ignorance and the blinding and forceful influence of the stampede for fame, fortune and power. There is more good, as a rule, in the things advocated by people we call cranks or fanatics than the ones who have not studied along that line thinks there possibly could be, for they have studied it and estimated the natural results to be expected from such conditions, and they are able and anxious to explain the whole matter in a clear comprehensive manner. Not like the unfounded arguments of suffragists, such as the remark that we (suffragists) know there is something in voting, or the men would not be so anxious to keep it all to themselves, as though it was a spirit of selfishness (instead of because it is proper and right) that prompts men to endeavor to keep women out of politics. It appears to me that it

would be impossible to find where men have done anything in a spirit of selfishness, or discrimination against women from the time of Adam to the present time. Where is the judgment or spirit of justice in an accuser when there is no evidence to substantiate their claims? We should not expect human beings to be absolutely perfect, nor should we expect all women to have the voice and charitable heart of Melba; the talent of Paderewski; the grace of a sylph; the figure of Venus; the vivacity of a coryphee; eyes like the soft glow of the moonlit eve; an alabaster complexion; virtues unapproachable; the charm of Cleopatra; the meekness of Moses; the patience of Job; the forbearance of Lazarus; the zeal of a Trojan; the constancy of the sun; the capabilities of a charwoman; the purse of the late Hetty Green, and hair of her own. It would be too much to expect a paragon like that, but we should make the best use possible of our gifts and capabilities and expect the same of others.

There is a great deal of scripture to support the contention of those who oppose "votes for women," also to show both men and women, some of their rights and duties, and we must not overlook the fact that both God and Jesus Christ gave their instructions to men principally. In other words, they put the men in charge of the affairs of the earth and it's their duty to serve. Jesus Christ according to St. Matthew, 22:37-39 inclusive, tells us the two great commandments are: first, Love God; second, Love thy neighbor as thyself. It is impossible to not love if we have a mind. Love for this or that or many things causes us to act, and that act is proof of love. Our actions speak the most forceful language.

Gen. 2:18: And the Lord God said, it is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an helpmeet for him.

Ask yourself what you would do if the boss of any job was to tell you, "Here is a helper for you," as you were about to start on a job of work; if that helper would not do enough to pay the cost of his or her board and clothing, and on top of that insist on the right to tell you just what was and what was not to be done, and said helper keep on increasing their expenses and decreasing their assisting qualities until you finally find said helper doing practically nothing except strive for the right to tell you what was to be done and how it should be done and who had it to do, but all this time you must stand the expense and take all the responsibility of said helper and everything else, and be expected to see to it that all is done on time and in order. Such is a word picture of many homes, especially where the wife is an advocate of woman suffrage.

Gen. 3:16: Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

Does that sound like equal rights or equal authority? Women can not spend time attending political and club meetings without casting God's word aside as though it was meaningless, for if they do as God has commanded them to do they will have no time for club meetings; woman suffrage meetings, card parties and such like, for such is only misdirected energy; a wasting of time and money; a plucking down the home movement.

Rom. 13:1-2: Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

Eph. 5:22-23-24: Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church; and he is the savior of the body.

Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything.

I. Cor. 14:33-37 inclusive: For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints.

Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also sayeth the law; And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.

What? Came the word of God out from you, or came it unto you only? If any man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.

I. Tim. 2:7-15 inclusive: Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle, I speak the truth in Christ and lie not a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.

8. I will therefore that men pray everywhere lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting.

9. In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair or gold, or pearls, or costly array.

10. But which becometh women professing godliness with good works.

11. Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

12. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

13. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

14. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression.



15. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in child-bearing if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

1. Tim., the entire third chapter: This is a true saying: If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.

2. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach.

3. Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous.

4. One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity.

5. For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?

6. Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.

7. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.

8. Likewise must the deacons be grave, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre.

9. Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.

10. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless.

11. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderous, sober, faithful in all things.

12. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well.

13. For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.

14. These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly.

15. But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

Titus 2:1-5 inclusive: But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine.

2. That the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience.

3. The aged women likewise, that they be in behavior as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things.

4. That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children.

5. To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.

Where do we find anything to indicate that woman authority is right?

Prov. 18:22: Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing and obtaineth favor of the Lord.

Does the above mean to say when she is not a good thing for the man she is not a wife? Undoubtedly there are many women married who have never been a wife.

I. Cor. 11:3: But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the women is the man; and the head of Christ is God.

I. Cor. 11:9: Neither was the man for the woman; but the woman for the man.

I believe that if it was possible for everybody to study the woman suffrage question before voting on it, that it would be voted down so completely that it would be only a matter of history for a few generations at least. The bible tells us the serpent induced Eve to eat of the forbidden fruit and thereby got its race into eternal trouble, and the human family as well, through allowing themselves to be persuaded to do contrary to God's instructions. Perhaps the human family could have resisted the temptation had it not been for the influence brought to bear upon Eve and Eve passing it on to Adam, but we find that God punishes the ones exerting the persuasive influence and the yielder to that influence likewise, so it looks reasonable that men would give the subject of votes for women a great deal of study before they grant that privilege and thereby bring a repetition of the condemnation caused by the yielding to woman in the Garden of Eden. Beware of the persuasive eloquence of woman suffrage agitators.

Are there many wives of the present time obeying the God-given instructions? Or are they looking at the temporary glittering, worldly things and people for their ideals with a hope that they will be able to wear the most costly apparel, the kind that is expensive and made in a manner to be as far as possible from serviceable, durable or modest? Is the extravagant display of apparel an expression of her desire to impart to all who see her that she is very wealthy, and the unreasonable cut down from the top and perhaps up from the bottom of her clothing just as far as she dare in order to escape arrest in public places, an expression of her desire to lead men to do ungodly things, or is it lack of brains or lack of education? Regardless of why they do as they do they are not impressing me with the idea that they are entitled to a vote because of their superior intelligence or morality, specially as long as men have the bulk of the responsibility on them, why should women have a voice in business affairs and bear so little of the resulting burdens even if there was nothing in God's word to portray woman's place and duties? Jesus Christ did not try to evade suf-

fering even to the dying on the cross in order to be in accord with God's wishes. To be worthy of the name Christian we must be followers of his example as far as is possible. Jesus Christ also showed it was necessary or right at times to stop wrongdoers by force and explain to them later, for we find in St. John 2:13: And the Jews' passover was at hand and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

14. And found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting.

15. And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money and overthrew the tables.

16. And said unto them that sold doves, take these things hence, make not my father's house an house of merchandise.

Does the foregoing scripture not indicate that Jesus must have cleaned house in haste? When you remember that he poured out the changers' money, you must realize he put them out in great haste or they would not have left their money. Now, if we are to follow the example of Jesus Christ, what are we going to do with those who insist on doing as they please regardless of what God's word says and regardless of what is reasonable? It looks reasonable to me to use any means necessary to force such ones out of places the bible forbids them to go and into their proper place, and we are failing to do our duty unless we do.

NEW YORK, Sept. 12, 1916.—The Episcopal Church is considering steps by which it will be made impossible for divorced persons to be married by any clergyman of their denomination. A commission consisting of five bishops and an equal number of priests and laymen has recommended to the general convention, which meets in St. Louis in October, that the canon law of the church be changed so as even to include the innocent party to a divorce action from being remarried. The great increase in divorce cases is given as the reason, the commission being convinced more rigorous restrictions are necessary.

Why do they not get after the cause in the form of working for laws that would aim at the ones that overstep their rightful bounds and those who fail to do their duty? Also have the church teach both men and women what is their reasonable duty and where their rights or authority stops, and what they are held responsible for and must manage. Failing to do their duty, coupled with the overstepping their authority, or one or the other, is what causes most divorces, and a great deal of this failing and overstepping is due to ignorance. Therefore, I would say teach men and women their duty and the children will get more training and environment of the right kind at home and not have so much to learn or suffer the consequences for not knowing after they are grown. It's plain to be seen that with increasing



woman authority we have proportionately increasing troubles, and it cannot be otherwise. God knew that everything must have one governing head to each and every concern or establishment in order to evade friction; that is God's ordained way, and that should be sufficient reason for running them that way. God's instructions are the basis of success. We should heed the lessons learned by comparing the failures of man-made laws (which do not conform to the laws of God) to produce satisfactory results and turn to God for guidance and use the motive power he has given us in unswerving loyalty to his commands, and we would practically have heaven on earth if all would do that one easy thing.

Gen. 3:17: And unto Adam he said: Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. We see here that because Adam hearkened unto the voice of his wife, and did contrary to God's instructions, he got the whole human family into serious trouble. Is this not a warning to men of today to do your duty and not allow your wives to talk you into doing ungodly things and thereby increase the troubles now and evermore? The child who does not obey its parents is almost sure to get into trouble and perhaps lose its life. Parents because of superior knowledge and love for their children, even in their human weakness, seldom give them bad advice. How much more reasonable it is that we should heed the advice of God, for just as sure as we are believers in God we cannot think of him making a mistake.

The Revision Committee on the Protestant Episcopal Church prayer book is making an effort to have special prayers adopted at their convention here this month (October, 1916). The committee has prepared a special prayer for the President of the United States and the Governor of the state. There will be presented for adoption a prayer for Congress, a petition for the army, and another for the navy, intercession for the courts of justice, a prayer for "Our Country" and for the "State Legislature." The committee also has written a special prayer to be said on the Fourth of July. I heartily approve of those prayers, for no doubt they will help get the mind in the right channel and the result will be they will work for that which they are praying. The instruction as to what is right and wrong is one thing that is generally neglected, and much needed knowledge which I hope people will get busy on, even if they do meet with strong opposition on certain points, as I know I will from many who read this booklet. We will find, as in all reform movements, that many who (like Paul the Apostle) will work against the cause at first, but after due consideration will be strong advocates of the cause they once so bitterly op-

posed. Suicides increased here in St. Louis, according to Coroner Padberg's report; in the year 1914 there were 178; 1915 there were 274. Can we not all see that the increase in murders, suicides, divorces and family troubles in general is largely due to woman authority, combined with unjust favors shown women in the courts and in our laws? Why not try God's plan and place godly and just restrictions on women? How often are women punished for bigamy? Is it not a fact that women can have two or three husbands and escape lawful punishment? How about Mrs. Maggie Hill of Oklahoma City, Okla., filing suit to divorce one man for nonsupport and asks the annulment of a marriage to another at the same time? It's not necessary to leave St. Louis to find them with two husbands. A man under similar circumstances would be given a penitentiary sentence. Still many women feel like they are unjustly treated and deprived of their rights when the fact is they are favored at all points.

There was quite a display here this last summer during the Democratic Convention period, there being a large number of woman suffrage agitators, mostly dressed in white with yellow about the waist and hat in some shape and a yellow umbrella completed their distinguishing marks. They seem to be proud of showing a yellow streak, but our soldier boys who were forced to wear some yellow this summer were very much humiliated. The yellow seems to indicate in some cases at least that the wearer of it lacks the necessary amount of principal to keep them from endeavoring to escape their duty whenever an unpleasant one confronts them, and I must admit I think it an ideal woman suffrage emblem. I venture to say that over 90 per cent of the money the woman suffrage agitators are spending in their demonstrations of that kind is money they never earned. It's money their husband has earned in many instances. You can look down the list of names of the agitators and find nearly every one of them is Mrs., etc. If their husband didn't let them have it, it is money they inherited or got in the form of alimony or breach of promise to marry, when perhaps, if the fact was known, they purposely or ignorantly did something to cause the breach. Do you think their acts display knowledge and a desire to be fair and do their duty? Do they not owe it to some one to make better use of that time and money?

Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, in a talk before a joint meeting of the City and Town Clubs here in St. Louis this year, declared that women will soon quit begging and demand justice from the men. In the face of all that men have done in this world to make it a more pleasant place to live and considering how little women have done to increase or help retain this worldly pleasure, does it not indicate a lack of good sense for a woman to complain, when the fact is she has thousands, if not millions, of things to help brighten life's pathway that we would

not have if men were as unthoughtful and lacking in their efforts to make improvements as women are, and all of these blessings are for women as completely as they are for men. The woman who thinks she is being imposed upon by the men is ignorant or void of reason. Mrs. Catt also said, I tell you the question of giving the vote to women has passed the educational stage, for every man alive knows the vote neither unsexes women nor makes her less feminine. There is not a single argument left against giving the vote to women. We have won the man's reason, now we are going to make him open up his heart to us and give us justice. That sounds as wise as it would for her to say the United States soldiers would have to all go home and stay there. In either case, it is evidence of lack of knowledge to want that which is injurious and absurd and false to say you are going to make some person do anything when you are too weak to enforce it. If she is so blind that she can not see even one argument against woman suffrage, she certainly needs a guardian. Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt was granted a decision by a Surrogate ruling in New York on May 9, 1916, which turns over a million dollars to her from the estate of the late Mrs. Frank Leslie. That money was bequeathed to Mrs. Catt to be used to promote the cause of suffrage. It's no wonder she can do many things. If my memory serves me right she came in possession of quite a large sum of money through the death of a husband, and I am quite sure that was her second one. Mrs. Catt is one of the class who has spent many thousands of dollars more than she ever earned. She and her followers, estimated to be about four million, taking the stand that they will swing to any party that will support their constitutional amendment, regardless of what that particular party stands for, and thereby demonstrating that they believe their issue is of the greatest importance shows again how blind they are to the best interests of our country. Do we need such voters? I say they are more to be condemned than those Americans who place the desire of the nation where their forefathers were born, ahead of the interests of this country or ahead of that which is right and just. I would like to put an exclamation point in here that would look like T. R.'s much talked-of big stick. This woman suffrage stumping is like hunting an imaginary hidden treasure. The ones in position to see the true result of its finding know it is like many other things; looks better while out of reach. It demonstrates high blood pressure or energy that they are almost forced to use. Lack of thoughtfulness or learning is the producer of such misdirected energy.

What a tremendous effort some people make to accomplish things that mean their loss and a loss to others, and, as usual, a tremendous effort produces results; thus we find them making a wonderful success along the line of being a failure.

If we had more women like Madame Melba, the celebrated Australian soprano singer and stage woman, who announced some time about the first of this year (1916) that she had not even so much as bought a hat for herself since the beginning of the terrible European war, but willing to give her home at 91 Av. Henri Martin, Paris, for a war hospital, and make every effort possible to secure doctors, nurses and other help that would donate their services in that home equipped with 100 beds; then after donating some \$200,000 she started on a tour of many lands endeavoring to raise, through concert entertainments, enough to make her total donations reach the great sum of \$500,000 for Red Cross work and not even discarding or laying aside her hobble skirts and generally out of date clothing. That is a true demonstration of brotherly love, such as the samaritan had and Jesus Christ taught in Luke 10:25-37, inclusive: And behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? (26) He said unto him, What is written in the law? How readest thou? (27) And he answering, said: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. (28) And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right; this do, and thou shalt live. (29) But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbor? (30) And Jesus, answering, said: A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead. (31) And by chance there came down a certain priest that way; and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. (32) And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side. (33) But a certain samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was; and when he saw him, he had compassion on him. (34) And went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. (35) And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two-pence, and gave them to the host, and said unto him: Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again, I will repay thee. (36) Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves? (37) And he said: He that showed mercy on him. Then Jesus said unto him: Go and do thou likewise.

Madame Melba is not the only good woman we have or ever did have on earth. Not by any means; there are many of them, but they are not found among the bunch who devote much time clamoring for votes for women. Charlotte Perkins Gilman is a noble woman. She has said that money obtained as a bribe; money stolen by whatever process; money accepted for a criminal act, or for work one has not

done; money claimed for breach of promise to marry; and alimony is shameful money. She also has stated it is vicious to make a living by the sale of illicit love and that it is ignominious to make a living by legitimate love, to be supported merely because one is a wife. But what degree of ignominy is that in which an ex-wife will take money from a man she no longer loves, legally or illegally, and to whom she no longer renders any service whatever? Should not any woman with the rudiments of a sense of honor, with a decent pride, prefer to work for a living, at any task whatever, to being reluctantly fed and clothed by an ex-husband? She also said that suppose the wife comes out of the matrimonial ship in a broken-down condition as a result of the marriage, that she should have damages from him the same as one would expect from a railroad for injuries received in an accident; but not alimony. Charlotte P. Gilman is showing good judgment in her argument. She is advocating the principals of justice such as would eliminate to a great extent the unjust decisions in favor of women for alimony and breach of promise extortions which are right in line or a close kin to blackmail, and tend to keep men of the most desirable type away from women of the right kind. A man of money knows that if he keeps company with a girl who is at least supposed to be a respectable, virtuous girl, he is taking a great chance of being sued for breach of promise to marry, whether such was the case or not, if he stops keeping company with her. The result is, he will go with one who is known to be a sport and perhaps very degraded, for he knows she could not make a breach of promise suit stick because it would be generally known that he nor anyone else would think of marrying her. Charlotte advocates many noble things, but I must get back to the subject of votes for women or the criticising of women and men who favor it. I have spoken of Charlotte because I admire her principles and want all to know I can see the good as well as the bad.

I believe a man should support his children, if he has any, whether the mother of those children is dead or alive, regardless of whether she is with him or away from him, but if he supports them he should have the right to designate who is to take care of them, for I don't believe it just for the mother and children to receive separate maintenance and have the mother continually telling the children what a scoundrel their father is, and many of her statements being false, as is sometimes the case.

The delegates to the National American Woman Suffrage Association, in convention September 8, 1916, at Atlantic City, N. J., decided the next annual convention in 1917 be held in March or thereabout; that a lobby be continued at Washington and that the association conduct a nation-wide campaign of education, agitation, organization and publicity in support of the Federal amendment. They also decided to



raise a million-dollar campaign fund between October this year and October next year (1917). It is reported that on September 9 they raised a suffrage campaign fund of \$818,800 in a half hour in cash and pledges. If they can donate like that does it not look like they have plenty of money and liberty? Why all the howl and complaint? It is a pity for women to be wasting time and money in such a way, especially at this time when there is so much suffering, which every effort in the world should be intended to help alleviate as far as possible, suffering that is so great that people are dying daily because they lack necessities of life; and on account of the terrible war now raging cannot get them from their near neighbor. I don't believe the acts of women show them more likely than men to consider the golden rule as a guide for their acts.

## CONDITIONS OF MARRIAGE FROM THE OHIO STATE JOURNAL.

The co-eds of the University of Minnesota were interviewed by the college newspaper on "How much salary must a man receive before you would consent to marry him?" The replies ranged from \$800.00 to \$10,000.00 a year, and they all averaged \$1,600.00. Beware of the girl who named \$10,000.00 salary, for it implies a low estimate on herself. The \$800.00 girl would prove a much happier match. One peculiar thing about these answers was that a majority of the girls demanded that their future husbands should be good dancers, that they should know the latest steps; and one girl said, the desire of her heart was for a "dreamy dancer." That sort of requirement may occur to women, a few of them, but to men it is ridiculous. A man may be a good dancer and a good man, but it is not dancing that makes him so. Smoking was encouraged, but drinking was outlawed, while card playing was reduced to whist, though one girl would allow her husband to go among the boys to play poker once a week. Is that not expression of childish thoughts? Taking the testimony altogether, it is not strange that there are so many divorces, when we realize minds of that capacity determined to have their way, regardless of what their husband might think of it. In all fairness, do you not think the average woman compares with a man as a child from eight to fourteen would compare with its widow mother who has worked hard battling the rain, snow, heat and cold, early and late, and even risking her life in many hazardous ways in an effort to keep up the home because of the love she has for the child and its companionship? She wants that child to live in ease and comfort and tries to supply that which will make the home an enjoyable place. Do you think she has less love for the child because it wants to do things it should not do? Oh, no, not if it refrains from doing such things after getting its mother's advice. The mother will just say the poor child could not see the evil results that are apt to result from such things, just as a man would say of his wife

if she made numerous mistakes, provided she did not insist on having her way against his wishes and instructions. Do you think the mother should let the child do any and everything it wants to just because it is helping some with the housework after God has given her the child and told her she is responsible for its acts? Do you think she is showing less love for the child if she compels it to submit to her rule? I don't; it's her plain duty, and because of her love for that child and having its welfare at heart, she should keep it as near the right track as possible by whatever means is necessary. She is going to permit it to do many things it should not do rather than hurt its feelings by stopping it, just as a man will a woman he loves. Do you think that child should go farther in the management of any of their affairs than to suggest? I don't, and that is exactly where woman belongs in this world. In either case, the less contention they cause the better they will be treated and the higher estimate will be placed on their judgment. Why don't women attempt to show by their actions how thankful they are for all the wonderful inventions the men have worked out and given to the world, instead of trying to get everything that's possible at his expense and then complaining about being mistreated. Such is very discouraging to men and indicates selfishness or lack of ability to think. It is generally admitted that the crop of old bachelors and old maids is increasing rapidly. We all know that is not the right way to live. How do we account for this increase? Some, perhaps, would say low wages and the high cost of living, but I believe it is principally due to the activity of the feministic movement that caused 821 less marriage licenses to be issued in St. Louis in 1915 than in 1914, and an increase in divorces.

At a meeting in Chicago during the first few days of September, 1916, the Commission of Bishops, Pastors and Laymen of an Episcopal Church decided to eliminate the word "obey" from the marriage ceremony. How is it such bible students and men one would expect to teach and work for God's wishes will, instead, keep on yielding to women beyond the limit God has designated? Is that not proof that men are still willing to take a chance of even being banished from God by going beyond all reason in their efforts to please women? Still many women complain of being unjustly deprived of things they are entitled to.

Dr. Richard Bolt, who is a son of R. O. Bolt of 5610 Bartmer avenue, St. Louis, Mo., delivered a lecture at the City Club recently in which he stated that the Chinese women dress more sensibly and modestly than the women of any other country. Dr. Bolt is located in Peking, China. Is that not a deplorable condition to exist? Is it not time for men of the more enlightened countries to tell their wives and daughters what they must not wear, since so many of them have shown

such poor judgment in the manner of their dress? It's humiliating to the men to have to speak of such a thing, but it's worse to realize he is permitting it, which is equivalent to sanctioning it.

Woman Suffrage advocates are not showing that they have well-balanced minds by continually annoying and threatening our government and state officials in their persistent efforts to gain votes for women. If they were not completely filled with selfishness and blind to the best interests of humanity and their duty, they would let up on the suffrage question at this time and turn their attention to aiding some one who perhaps is dying of starvation, through no fault of their own, if they have any time to spare after doing their duty at home. Our President and government officials have many very important questions to handle at all times and should not be interrupted unless some important question of a nature that cannot well be delayed is to be attended to. The very life of this country has been at stake many times during this present administration, and good judgment demands silence on trivial matters at such times, but we notice the woman suffrage advocates continually annoying and interrupting our officials.

In a St. Louis paper of July 10th, 1916, under a heading "Contributions for Aid of Militiamen's Families Sought," we find a very earnest appeal to the people of St. Louis for them to rally to the support of the ones dependent on 363 of the 1500 soldiers that left here recently for service at the Mexican border. Now, when we stop and think this matter over, it looks ridiculous that such a large percentage of dependents could be found in need when a large number of the soldiers are not married and most of those who quit jobs to go had part or full salary coming to them from their employer for some length of time. Many of them were to receive such pay during the time of their service for the government. There was also a government salary of some amount. There is something radically wrong or there would not have been so many calls for help. No doubt some were in need and there is no reasonable reason why they should not be kept from suffering if they were willing to try to help themselves. We who have been reading the papers know that the trains carrying the soldiers had scarcely got out of sight when cries went up for help for the dependents. Is that not an open acknowledgment that women are as dependent on men for their support as is a child at the age of twelve years? If such is the case, why should they have any more right to say how the affairs of this world should be run than the twelve-year-old child? Why do we tolerate a law that entitles a woman to any of a man's property just because she has been married to him, or one that makes it necessary for her to sign legal papers of any kind in his business affairs? Does not every fair-minded person who is twenty-five years old or older know that such as the above and the allowing of money for breach of prom-



ise and alimony have a great influence toward keeping men of knowledge or money from marrying, thus aiding in the destruction of a God-given ordinance of very great importance. There is no law to compel a man to marry, nor is it possible to compel him to keep on putting up with the unjust burdens that a large percentage of men find has been placed up on them by the one they loved enough to marry and believed that she loved him to the extent that she would treat him justly. Women have been let have their way and received so much easy money that it now is next to impossible for them to be fair and just. The one who earns the money is the one who should know what is being done with it, and it is out of place for the other to do more than suggest what be done with it. Suicides, homicides and murders are increasing rapidly; no doubt many of them are the result of lack of training in childhood. A child that is not given to understand that it must obey those who have a right to give it orders and that it cannot have everything it wants, will naturally become desperate when in later years it has to face the cold, stern problems of life and do many things it should not do, thereby causing itself and many who come within its sphere of influence much suffering and sometimes death. It has been said the hand that rocks the cradle shall rule the world, and I believe it's true, but not in the sense that some women suffrage agitators quote it. They would like to make everybody believe that means woman law-makers and woman rulers, but I believe most people will agree with me that the intended meaning of "the hand that rocks the cradle shall rule the world," is that the childhood training shapes the acts of the adult. Some will become wayward for a season, but most of those will stop some time in their reckless rush through life and make a firm resolution to do as mother taught them during their childhood days if they had a good mother, and the majority will never depart therefrom, thus placing the rocker of the cradle of today in charge of the world thirty years hence.

In a St. Louis paper we find a statement from a Vandalia, Ill., man who signs himself E. M. J. He claims to know some of the results of woman suffrage. He tells us in his statement that he was judge of election in one of their township elections and that out of eight or nine hundred legal voters in their precinct there were nearly five hundred voted and just three women, thus showing the small percentage in favor of woman suffrage there. The same writer tells of another of their city elections when it happened that they had about five hundred men and over three hundred women who voted. He said it was not strange that so many women voted that time, for one of the nice, sweet female voters as she came out of the voting place, showed three silver dollars and told several that was what she got for her vote, thus making it clear why so many women were voting that day. He also

states that at another election the vote catchers were informed where there were one male voter and five female voters in one house, so he hastened in his auto and learned they were there and that it took just thirty dollars to get them to vote, so that man left in disgust, but another of the opposing party called for them and they all came to the polls and voted. Where is the purifying of politics by votes of women? At least one woman has said that she thought the reason why women in general will resort to more unprincipled methods to secure money than men will, is due to their lack of earning power, and she might have added coupled with their almost unlimited desires.

The women of East St. Louis, Ill., were displeased because of a ruling of the Illinois Supreme Court last spring unseating Miss Josie Westfall as Judge of the City Court of Macomb, Ill., because she was elected by women's votes. Women of Illinois cannot vote for the office of Judge, according to the ruling. Have women ever shown that they are broad-minded, deep thinkers, such as a Judge should be? If so, I would like to know where and when. I do not blame them for that, for it's no fault of theirs, but it unfits them for the office. God has specially designed and designated and capacitated women to deal with children and help in the home, which is her domain. We are all aware that the majority of the women of the U. S. A. do not want to vote and would not even if they could, except for money. Even the most radical suffragist feels sure such is the case, and that if the women had a vote on it they would vote it out of their own hands. In country districts it is a difficult matter for men to vote, and women of such districts would nearly all remain away from the polls; we would thus be deprived of the vote from the country women, who are living nearer a Godly life than any other class of women we can find. We would in this way have principally the undesirable class of women that appear in all cities, always striving to corrupt and lead to destruction such things and people as would have a good chance to be right, had it not been for their influence; therefore, votes for women would degrade politics, for a large number of the best women in the cities would not vote. We should show by our words and deeds that we are trying to improve the conditions of this world, and there is no more essential act than to oppose votes for women first, last, and all the time. With the granting of votes for women comes a modification in the attitude of tenderness and courtesy toward women. The attitude of courtesy toward women loses in proportion to the advance of the feminist movement. The people who have the greatest number of things to complain about (mostly imaginary) are those who spend much time in idleness or something worse. If they would only get busy on some job which is beneficial to themselves and others, many of their grievances would be forgotten and everybody would be happier. Peace of mind is perhaps the one

thing most to be desired on earth, and is perhaps the one thing that is nearest attained by not making any special effort to get it. In other words, you can gain more of it by attempting to accomplish something else. God has placed within us a desire for the companionship of one of the opposite sex, one to whom we can go for consolation at all times, and who can at all times be depended upon to assist as though the other was a part of the one body composed of two parts. We only have to read the daily papers to see where one after another commit suicide on account of the loss of this God-ordained companionship, life is not complete without it; therefore we should attempt to frame our laws in such a manner as are necessary to aid and encourage marriage. Our laws should give men absolute control, for that is what God gave him, and if a woman had no legal right to argue a point or question with her husband, she would seldom take the chance of attempting to argue, and we would have homes without contention and the women would get far better treatment and be more respected by all. We all know that it's natural for a man to do all in his power to make things pleasant for a woman he likes or loves, unless she aggravates him by overstepping her rightful privileges. The man who accepts the bonds of matrimony under our present laws, is taking a more hazardous risk than he would be if he sold himself into the bondage of slavery. If the woman fails to do her duty and makes life so miserable for the husband that he can stand it no longer the only recourse he has is the divorce court. He perhaps has accepted her promises that she never would fail to do her duty again if he would only forgive and forget the past, and pleaded earnestly for him to do that, and time after time she does everything in her power to cause him to lose money and have trouble until finally, destitute of worldly goods and broken in health, he leaves. She then sues him for support and he can count himself lucky if he does not have to serve a term in jail or a workhouse sentence for not sufficiently supporting that woman while he is endeavoring to save enough money to pay costs in the enforced divorce action. He also finds that he cannot sue her for a divorce until he pays an attorney fee for her side of the case and perhaps some other costs for her if she claims she is short of funds to protect herself. Does it look reasonable that a man who knew the hazardous risk and the weight of the shackles he is forced to accept when he takes unto himself a wife would ever take such a chance? Who is to blame for the greater part of the family quarrels, separations and divorces? Also, for those who never marry. If I was to answer that question I would say those who have made so many ungodly and unjust laws. Is it not time to give this matter some serious, prayerful consideration, asking ourselves: are we a party to something that is worse than war, and that is what I believe our domestic condition is today. They are such that there is no such

thing as for the average man to be happy. He can't be happy and contented single unless he is a shallow bunch of frivolity, and owing to our unjust laws he can't be happy married unless he has been unusually fortunate in getting a good wife. God has placed within men a desire to comply with the wishes of a woman if she will only let her desire be known to him in a spirit of meekness instead of in the form of a demand; to comply to a demand is either an act portraying cowardice or subjection or to acknowledge you failed to do your duty and in all such cases you are robbed of the pleasure there should be in the doing if not placed where it is a disagreeable task.

The more we force people to do, the greater robbers we are, for we have robbed them of all the pleasure there should have been in the doing of those things. We should have a system of teaching people their duty more clearly and less laws to force them to do things.

If men decide it would be nearer right and just for women to vote and want to please them they should let the women cast their votes for and against woman suffrage and if they favor it compel them to share equally with the men all responsibilities and burdens of life, because it is unjust to place authority one place and the responsibility in another. They should forfeit all claims on men for support and all shares in the man's property and declare themselves equal and independent. She should have no courtesy shown her on account of her sex, for that is equality. If they were getting the worst of the deal in any way then there might be some reason to complain, but such is not the case. Men have tried to honor and respect women as their superior in modesty and refinement, but it looks like they are determined to step down that step and mix in politics, a place which is only a step or two from the lowest on earth in most cases of voting and holding small offices. Thus they would lose the most valuable asset they have, that being the estimate man places on woman's superior refinement and modesty. Everybody should try to excel in some specialized undertaking and thereby have a redeeming feature. The women accepting the duty of bearing children and rearing them and engaged in domestic and home making matters have never to any great extent conceived an idea that they were deprived of any right or not represented because they do not vote. It's usually the society women who have squandered time and money at clubs and parties who do the complaining. Nearly everything there is in this world to make it more pleasant to live in is either the gift of God direct or through men. Therefore, if women in the face of all these facts are still going to complain don't it look like it is the rankest foolishness to try to please them? It would be impossible. They spend great sums of money trying to keep up with society and style. I class that wastefulness as one of the devil's great harvest fields. All women should be

married. It's God's plan. They should obey their husbands; it's God's plan. Then if they did vote their vote should be the same as their husband's. The result is then only changed to the extent that the expense of elections would be about double and the returns delayed. The rough element of women would be sure to be there, so if it would be possible to keep up the standard of purity of the polls the better class or classes would be forced to be there. I had the pleasure of attending a meeting in Sheldon Memorial, 3646 Washington boulevard, one evening last winter. The object of the meeting was to bring pressure to bear on the heads of our government to intercede for the Jews in Russia and other countries where they are not enjoying equal rights although they are helping the country in all possible ways even to giving their lives on the battle field. We heard some very good talks by four men; then to my surprise some woman was given the floor and during her very short talk which was all about women and their rights. she said that women suffered most by wars; also that if women ever had a say there would be no wars. That they were kind-hearted and full of sympathy, especially for women and children.

If so, why are they not putting all their spare energy in the line of relief work now instead of spending the money (that in most cases) some man has earned and time clamoring for something that cannot benefit anyone?

Would just like to ask such women if they are unable to see that woman's hardships in time of war is only equal to the man's duties in time of peace. How long would they last in the trenches, perhaps in the mud and rain and the snow, continually exposed to shot and shell and the roar of the cannon, and undesirable food and a shortage of sleep. Such is man's life in time of war while the women are back from the firing line with a house for shelter and beds to sleep in, etc. Is it not unreasonable to state that women suffer most in time of war (that is if she meant women suffer more than men)? Would like to ask them how they will keep from having wars? Is it to be peace at any price? If so, that is far worse than war, but that is not the way they act at home. The ideal of man's relationship toward woman is that of protection and husbandry. Many women who advocate votes for women have so many fanciful and unattainable delusions that it helps to prove how brainless they are. No equal suffrage state so far as I can learn has any more beneficial laws than the states where they are denied the ballot.

It is naturally in a human to aid the weak or overburdened that come to their notice, and it is likewise as firmly if not more so set in us to withdraw our aid as soon as that unfortunate shows that it fails to see that it has received anything and tells the one or those who have been doing so much for it that we are equal and I can do anything



you can and demands other things. Such is the case with woman suffragists. The more they try to push to the level the nearer they will get to it and if ever attained they will find ever increasing hardships and the lowering of the standard of habits of both men and women. If people cannot live harmoniously as man and wife the result will be that they will quit marrying and many will look for free love with no responsibilities and the children will be reared in disgrace as orphans to help increase the reform school attendance, perhaps; as is the case with the children of divorced people I believe it's about sixty per cent of the children in the reform schools are those of divorced parents.

A husband has a legal right to caress his wife and to lay her across his knee and spank her soundly if she repulses his affectionate advances. This was the decision made by Magistrate Steers in Brooklyn a short time ago when Mrs. Katherine Becker appeared against her husband Charles, arraigned on a charge of assault. About a week ago she got sore, said Becker. She resisted my affections. I tried to put my arm around her and she slapped my face. I just laid her over my knee and spanked her good and hard. The court ordered Becker's discharge, declaring a man had a right to be affectionate with his own wife, and to spank her if she repulsed him. I feel that Magistrate Steers is entitled to a great deal of praise for that decision, for it, no doubt, is as just as though it was direct from God. I hope the time will come when the law of the land will uphold a man who uses any means necessary to get his wife to do his bidding just so the man is not demanding unreasonable things. The husband certainly is entitled to rule the entire home. That is a reasonable and God-given authority and the wife should not be allowed to argue the question anywhere except in court, that being the only way a home can run smoothly. As long as men are expected to support homes it is reasonable that they be the head and do the voting for it. The affairs of men are no longer within their control. Women insist on meddling with men's affairs and men permit it to quite an extent in an attempt to evade contention, but it creates a feeling of righteous resentment in the minds of the well informed, thoughtful men. We should remember or realize we are all sailing in one boat here and that we have been assigned to our respective places by our creator and master and to desert our post of duty even by comparatively few causes a great deal of discomfort to all and may lead to eternal destruction.

Our duty must not be lightly considered if we are to be a benefit to this world instead of a thorn in the flesh or a stumbling block over which some will fall to everlasting destruction after a life of misery. Is it expected by those who favor woman suffrage that before a woman is elected to an office where she will associate in a business way with

men that she will have to agree to wear clothing that conforms to certain rules or measurements or do they expect we will pass restrictive laws to govern the woman office holder's manner of dress and general habits so they will not appear for duty with a calcimine complexion tinted with great care, cheese-cloth shirtwaists and elaborately puffed hair, abbreviated skirts and striped stockings, and judging from the past, we see plainly there is no way of even making a good guess at what they will do and still claim they are dressed in a manner which entitles them to the respect due a modest lady.

We all know people are human and have a natural desire for the companionship of the opposite sex and that many office holders are away from home quite a long time attending to the duties of their office and there is danger of the mind drifting away from the business the people are paying them to attend to, and fall a victim of animal desires under such circumstances.

Do the thinking men of this country not think their wives would be more content with them in an office where women have no place.

Do they not also know that it's next to impossible to keep the mind uninterruptedly on business where mixed sexes compose the membership?

Look before you leap or you may splash mud and slime on your best friends when you light.

Don't do things blindly nor because others want you to.

If that is your position on any amendment that is being voted on vote against it.

If after careful study and consideration you believe it to be right and beneficial, vote for it, but not otherwise.

ROBT. C. WALSH.

**P D 74.**















DUNN BROS.  
LIBRARY BINDING

JAN 76

ST. AUGUSTINE  
FLA.



32084



